

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Fine Arts Council

Minutes of Meeting of January 14, 1994

Present: D. Andrus (Acting Chair); K. Austin, C. Bernard, R. Bigelow, A. Calisch, M. Corwin, A. Dutkewych, B. Foss, N. Fraser, G. Garvey, J. Helland, S. Hudson, C. Jackson, J. Kelly, C. Kuilman, M. Kusy, E. Langley, B. Layne, N. Long, E. Mongerson, D. Pariser, P. Regimald, P. Rist, M. Ruwedel, E. Saccá, D. Turner, K. Tweedie, N. Wagner, B. Wainwright, C. Zucker

Absent with apologies:

T. Bui, N. Helms, D. Moore, R.J. Parker

Guests: L.Bien, D. Dobrofsky, J.-P. Duchesne, G. Milton, C. Mota

1. Approval of the Agenda

In the absence of Dean Parker, D. Andrus acted as Chair for the meeting. Items 3, 4 and 5 were deleted from the agenda. Another item was added: Modification of Graduate Curriculum Report #41. The agenda was then approved, as amended.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of November 26, 1993

MOTION: (Mongerson, Hudson)

"that the minutes of the meeting of November 26, 1993 be approved."

CARRIED

3. Modification of Graduate Curriculum Report #41

MOTION: (Tweedie, Jackson)

"that the Modification of Graduate Curriculum Report #41 be approved."

K. Tweedie explained that Graduate Curriculum Report #41 had been approved by Council in September 1993. The Report had recommended the amalgamation of the Diploma and the M.A. in Art Therapy. While the two programmes had been 30 and 45 credits respectively (a total of 75 credits), the newly proposed and amalgamated M.A. programme will consist of 60 credits.

During the subsequent approval process, further modifications to the M.A. in Art Therapy were recommended, in particular, that two options (A and B) be made available. Option A will consist of two 6 credit courses, Research Paper I and II. Option B will consist of one 6 credit course, Applied Project with Report, and a 3 credit Comprehensive Examination.

These proposed modifications address the need for non-thesis options in the programme, and ensure government financing of the 60 credit programme.

K. Austin asked whether the modifications would mean an increase in workload for faculty. A. Calisch explained that all faculty in the programme are expected to supervise thesis and research students; these activities are considered part of the normal duties of faculty in graduate programmes, and will not change with the proposed modifications.

The question was then called and **CARRIED**.

4. Report and Recommendations on the Academic Planning and Budget Processes (FFAC-94-01-14-D1)

D. Andrus introduced M. Kusy and G. Milton, who were present to provide information on the above report.

G. Milton provided some background to the report. In January 1993, Senate approved the sub-committee's first report and requested that mechanisms be developed to implement the academic planning and budget processes identified in the report. This second report is the result of those deliberations.

He began by stating that there had been general agreement in the University that the principles in the first report are sound; that is, that the needs of the academic sector have primacy in the university-wide planning process, and that the planning process should inform the budget process.

Among other recommendations, the second report calls for a three stage process which includes academic planning, the allocation of sectoral budgets, and the academic budget process. It is recommended that planning and budget committees be established in each department, and in each Faculty.

In addition, the report recommends that the University establish a five year rolling budget, though it is recommended that the budget be reviewed annually and continuously. It also notes that improved access to specialized types of information, e.g. financial information, demographics, student enrolment patterns, discipline-specific information, will be needed by departmental and Faculty committees to facilitate their work. In general, the process is to be open and transparent, and provide opportunities at every stage of its development to explain the basis on which decisions have been made.

D. Andrus thanked G. Milton for his summary, and then asked for questions from the floor.

S. Hudson asked what role the unions would have in such a process. G. Milton replied that, in his opinion, collective bargaining may be seen as an opportunity rather than a constraint. An academic planning process that is structured and related to the other sectors may permit different items to come forward for negotiation.

P. Rist inquired if the proposal included the capital budget, as well as the operating budget. G. Milton responded that it did. He added that, in terms of the University's soon to be launched Capital Campaign, a long term plan would be extremely helpful when attempting to raise money with corporations.

A. Calisch suggested that education and support would be helpful, as many departments have never participated in a process such as this before.

R. Bigelow noted that this type of process calls for departments to analyze all costs (operating and capital) associated with their academic planning. This accountability should avert the need for situations of "crisis management" that many departments have historically used to increase their resources. M. Kusy noted that if the information is universally available, it decreases the likelihood of this happening.

K. Austin asked whether budgets would come before Council for approval. M. Kusy suggested that the proposed Faculty Budget and Planning Committees would have an obligation to develop the Faculty's position, communicate it back to the departments, and to the rest of the academic sector. While in agreement with the establishment of the Faculty committee, K. Austin saw as a deficiency that the Report does not indicate to whom the Committee will report. As the body for academic governance in the Faculty is Faculty Council, he would like to see this reporting structure made clear in the final document. M. Kusy noted this concern.

G. Garvey asked how the proposed five year planning system would mesh with the deficit reduction process. G. Milton responded that this process, if in place, would be helpful, as it clearly places responsibility on the academic sector, and ensures that decisions are made with consultation, rather than decreed.

K. Tweedie reflected upon the Art Therapy modifications and the way in which curriculum may be shaped by budgetary concerns. G. Milton responded that as the planning process takes hold, it is anticipated that more information on financing will become widely available and inform the process from the outset.

B. Layne asked when the process was to begin. G. Milton explained that though full implementation was originally projected to begin in May 1994, it may only be possible to partially implement the process this year.

E. Langley voiced support for the report's recommendations. However, having recently been

involved in a budget committee composed of all department chairs in Fine Arts, she noted that this process is quite time consuming. She would suggest that some provision for discretionary action be built in.

P. Regimbald noted that the "non-academic" sector is also under constraints; a long term plan for the academic sector will help service units better prioritize their already limited resources.

G. Garvey asked where the budget figures given to departments would come from. M. Kusy responded that, for the first time, departments would be given complete rather than partial budget information, including salary, non-salary, and capital budgets. They will have control over both physical and human resources.

K. Austin voiced his support of the report. In a larger context, he saw it as the beginning of a re-structuring of the University, in that the critical mass of a unit will determine what it can and cannot reasonably achieve. He suggested that the self-appraisal of units will also need to address these issues.

E. Mongerson asked whether the public release of salary information in a small unit, even if aggregated, would breach confidentiality. M. Kusy noted this concern, and stated that it may be a trade off for having an open process.

E. Saccá drew Council's attention to Recommendation 6 on page 5, which calls for the University to hold back a percentage of the budget for development. She questioned what process would be used to re-assign these funds. M. Kusy responded that without a mechanism such as this to generate "new" funds, the University would stagnate. E. Saccá suggested that a process for its allocation be specified, so that members of the community have confidence in how decisions will be made.

As there were no further questions, D. Andrus thanked both G. Milton and M. Kusy for their participation in Council's discussion.

5. Adjournment

MOTION: (Layne, Langley)

"that the meeting be adjourned."

CARRIED

Respectfully submitted,

S. McLeod
January 21, 1994